2.3

24

1	(Case called)
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: For Defendant James Cahill,
3	appearance.
4	MR. TALKIN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Sam Talkin
5	for Mr. Cahill who is in my office social distancing from me
6	over my left shoulder. We have discussed the details of a
7	video appearance today, and he has consented to it proceeding
8	as a video.
9	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Talkin.
10	THE DEPUTY CLERK: For Christopher Kraft.
11	MR. SAPONE: Good afternoon, your Honor. Edward
12	Sapone for Mr. Kraft who dialed in and who also consents.
13	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Sapone.
14	MR. SAPONE: You're welcome.
15	THE DEPUTY CLERK: For Defendant Patrick Hill.
16	MR. EBANKS: Albert Ebanks, your Honor, on behalf of
17	Patrick Hill. Good afternoon, your Honor. My client is
18	listening in and consents to proceeding via video.
19	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Ebanks.
20	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Matthew Norton.
21	MR. FROCCARO: Good afternoon, your Honor. James
22	Froccaro for Mr. Norton. He's seated behind me, your Honor,
23	and he consents to proceeding by video for this conference.
24	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Froccaro.
٥٢	THE DEDUCT OF DEV. Milliam Management

THE DEPUTY CLERK: William Wangerman.

1 MR. MAAS: Brian Maas and Tyler Maulsby for 2 Mr. Wangerman. We're substituting in today, your Honor, for 3 Jill Shellow who previously appeared for him. Mr. Wangerman is on the line and consents to proceeding by video. 4 THE COURT: 5 Thanks, Mr. Maas. THE DEPUTY CLERK: Kevin McCarron. 6 7 MS. ABATE: Good morning, your Honor. This is Camille 8 Abate representing Kevin McCarron. Mr. McCarron is also on the 9 line, and he does consent to appearing this way. 10 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Abate. 11 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Jeremy Sheeran. 12 MR. LIPTON: Evan Lipton on behalf of Jeremy Sheeran 13 who is appearing by telephone and consents to proceed remotely. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. 15 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Andrew McKeon. 16 MR. ZISSOU: Steve Zissou appears for Mr. McKeon. 17 Your Honor, Mr. McKeon is on the phone. He's called in 18 separately. He consents to proceeding in the manner in which 19 the Court has established the conference for today. 20 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Zissou. 21 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Robert Egan. 22 MR. RIOPELLE: Roland Riopelle for Robert Egan. 2.3 Mr. Egan is here with me in my office today, and we consent to 24 proceed by video, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Riopelle.

KATYASHC:20-cr-00521-CM DockHOCEOVFAeCELEPAZOEPage 5 of 18 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Scott Roche. 1 2 MR. MORAK: Good afternoon, your Honor. Glenn Morak 3 and Alan Abramson for Scott Roche. Mr. Roche has dialed in, 4 and he of course consents to proceeding by video. 5 THE COURT: Thank you. THE DEPUTY CLERK: And Arthur Gipson. 6 7 MR. KALEY: Good afternoon, your Honor. John Kaley 8 for Mr. Gipson. Mr. Gipson is present with me in my office, 9 and he consents to this proceeding by video. 10 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kaley. 11 THE DEPUTY CLERK: For the government. 12 MR. SWERGOLD: Good afternoon, your Honor. For the 13 government, Assistant United states Attorneys Jason Swergold, 14 Danielle Sassoon, and Jun Xiang, and special Assistant United 15 States Attorney Laura De Oliveira. 16 THE COURT: Thank you, all. 17 I want to start by apologizing for last week. It was 18 a mess. And I do very much apologize. If I hadn't cut it off, none of it would have been recorded for posterity. 19 20

As it turns out, the court reporter could not hear a single word of what was going on over the traffic noise, the back chatter, and the other problems. So I made the right call. I may have made it in a 'moment of peek, but I made the right call.

21

22

23

24

25

This is probably the second appearance on the

indictment I believe because there was an arraignment in mag court; is that correct?

MR. SWERGOLD: Yes.

2.3

THE COURT: We have a new Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure, thanks to Congress, which has decided that it should start drafting rules of procedures, since it has nothing better to do.

So I am today orally and subsequent to this proceeding in writing entering pursuant to Rule 5(f) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure the following order:

The government must disclose to the defense all information "favorable to an accused" that is, "material either to guilt or to punishment" and that is known to the government.

This obligation applies regardless of whether the information would itself constitute admissible evidence. The government shall make good-faith efforts to disclose such information to the defense as soon as reasonably possible after its existence becomes known to the government, so as to enable the defense to make effective use of the information in the preparation of its case.

This obligation applies regardless of whether the information would itself constitute admissible evidence.

The's government shall disclose such information to the defense promptly after its existence becomes known to the government so that the defense may make effective use of the

information in the preparation of the case.

2.3

As part of these obligations, the government must disclose any information that can be used to impeach the trial testimony of a government witness within the meaning of *Giglio v. United States*, 405 U.S. 150 (1972), and its progeny.

Such information must be disclosed sufficiently in advance of the trial in order for the defendant to make effective use of it at trial or at such other time as the Court may order. The foregoing obligations are continuing and apply to materials that become known to the government in the future.

Additionally, as information is otherwise subject to disclosure, it must be disclosed regardless of whether the government credits it.

In the event the government believes that disclosure under this order would compromise witness safety, victim rights, national security, a sensitive law enforcement technique, or any other substantial government interest, it may apply to the Court for a modification of its obligation, which may include in-camera review or withholding or subjecting to a protective order or a part of the information otherwise subject to disclosure.

For purposes of this order, the word "government" includes all, current, or former federal, state, and local prosecutors, law enforcement officers, and other officers who have participated in the prosecution or investigation that led

to this prosecution of the offense or offenses with which the 1 2 defendants are charged. The government has an affirmative 3 obligation to seek from such sources all information subject to 4 disclosure under this order. 5 If the government fails to comply with this order, the Court, in addition to ordering production of the information, 6 7 may: One, specify the terms and conditions of such 8 9 production; 10 Two, grant a continuance; 11 Three, impose evidentiary sanctions; Four, impose sanctions on any responsible lawyer for 12 13 the government; 14 Five, dismiss charges before trial or vacate a 15 conviction after trial or a guilty plea; 16 Or, Six, enter any other order that is just under the 17 circumstances. 18 Mr. Swergold, do you acknowledge having heard 19 everything I just said? 20 MR. SWERGOLD: Yes, your Honor. I do. 21 THE COURT: I would like every other member of your 22 team to acknowledge that he has heard or she has heard what 2.3 I've just said. 24 MR. XIANG: Yes, your Honor. This is Jun Xiang for

the government, and I concur.

MS. SASSOON: This is Danielle Sassoon for the government, and I acknowledge.

2.3

MS. OLIVEIRA: Your Honor, this is Special AUSA Laura
De Oliveira, and I also acknowledge.

THE COURT: Oaky. Well, this will be entered in writing at the conclusion of this proceeding. That's our new procedure, folks, to be done in this district at the first appearance on an indictment or an information. We'll be entering back orders in a lot of cases.

Okay. Who is going to talk for the government?

MR. SWERGOLD: This is Jason Swergold. I will, your

Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Swergold, just tell me what this is about.

MR. SWERGOLD: Your Honor, so I'll give you a quick procedural history of the case and then the background of the charges, and then I can discuss the discovery in this case.

An indictment was returned on October 1. Defendant

James Cahill was arrested the evening before, on September 30.

The rest of the defendants were arrested the morning of

October 1, and everybody was presented and arraigned on that

date.

The charges in this indictment arise from a multi-year investigation into union corruption, an investigation that involved wiretaps, recorded bribes, searches, surveillance, and

focused on official at two unions, Steamfitters Local 638 and Plumbers Local 200.

The defendants were current and former officials at these unions who agreed with each other to accept bribes and betray their union's trust by taking actions favorable to nonunion employers.

The majority of these defendants were business agents. Those are union officials who were assigned to manage certain geographical areas for their union, and they're responsible for the day-to-day management of their union's interactions with contractors in those areas. As part of their responsibilities, they're expected to work to ensure that contracts are awarded to employers who employ members of their union.

Now, the charge in this case include a RICO conspiracy against nine of the defendants, an honest services wire fraud conspiracy against all 11 of the defendants, and a Taft-Hartley conspiracy against all 11 of the defendants.

At the center of the RICO conspiracy, your Honor, charged in Count One is James Cahill, at the time the president of the New York State Building & Construction Trades Council.

So your Honor understands, the Trades Council represents over 200 unionized construction workers in New York state, including steamfitters from Local 638 and plumbers from Local 200.

That made him one of the most powerful labor officials

2.3

in the state. And he used that position, your Honor, to bring other members, other defendants, into this enterprise. He exercised considerable influence over the affairs of the enterprise, which we've defined as these current and former officials of Local 638.

And these members of the RICO enterprise, instead of looking out for the interests of their unions, they committed honest services fraud, Taft-Hartley violations, and state bribery offenses.

And the indictment sets forth just some examples of the recorded conversations these defendants had in which they explicitly discussed the actions that they would take in exchange for (inaudible).

In one meeting, Mr. Cahill instructed a nonunion employer not to sign with the union, despite the fact that Mr. Cahill's job was to represent the interests of hundreds of thousands of union workers.

Defendant Patrick Hill told a nonunion employer that Local 638, of which he was a business agent, wouldn't make trouble for that nonunion employer in Hill's geographic territory.

More than one of the defendants referred to receiving bribes as "the real world and a place where there is wiggle room, so long as everybody gets taken care of," meaning everybody's bribed.

2.3

So that's an overview of the charges, your Honor. If your Honor would like, I can now discuss what discovery would look like in this case or answer any specific questions about the nature of this case.

THE COURT: Let's talk about discovery.

MR. SWERGOLD: Thank you, your Honor.

So as your Honor is aware, the parties had negotiated a protective order which we submitted and your Honor has now signed. We've also been collecting hard drives from all of the defendants to load the discovery, and we have it from almost all of them.

There is a substantial amount of discovery in this case, both electronic materials, hard-copy materials that are being digitized and scanned. And we've been working to organize all of those files for purposes of discovery. And we are currently finalizing stamping and will begin burning today for the defendants who have already sent up the drives.

The major categories of discovery, your Honor, are wiretap recordings and associated data and reports and paperwork for those wiretaps. There were wiretaps on three of the defendants in this case. And then there are some other wiretaps for non-charged individuals that had captured some of the defendants. We'll be making a production of that as well.

There are many dozen consensual recordings, audio and video, with accompanying surveillance photographs, prerecorded

bribe money, law enforcement reports.

We also have draft transcripts of many of the meetings. And pursuant to a stipulation that we've entered into with the defendants, we will be producing draft transcripts for many of these meetings to assist the defendants in working through that discovery.

There is also a significant amount of phone records, call detail records, pen register data, bank and financial records, cell site GPS warrants, an automobile tracking warrant, email and iCloud search warrants, and searches from one dozen phones seized on the day of the takedown.

The initial production is going to consistent of what I think is the most important discovery for purposes of the defendants getting a handle on the charges against them, which would be the video and audio recordings of the meetings that the defendants are captured on, as well as the photo surveillance and the draft transcripts.

For all of the phones that we've been able to unlock to date, we will also be producing the forensic images of those phones to the particular defendants.

In the next round of discovery, we're going to prioritize the warrant application, the wiretaps, phone records, bank records, and additional law enforcement reports. Our current estimate is that we will be able to complete the vast majority of all Rule 16 discovery within approximately 60

1 days.

2.3

There are just a few areas that I want to flag for your Honor and defense counsel regarding that 60-day period. The first is electronically stored information.

With respect to some of the cell phones, we've had to send them out because they were locked and we need a vendor to try to unlock them. We will obviously review and produce them expeditiously when we receive them back from the vendor. We have undertaken and continue to undertake responsiveness reviews on electronically stored information and will be making those productions on a rolling basis.

And then finally, we have been receiving and will likely continue to receive responses from entities that we have subpoenaed. And we will of course continue to produce the material that we receive in response to the subpoenas on a rolling basis. So that of course could end up being past the 60-day time period as various entities comply with our subpoenas.

THE COURT: Okay. Who is going to speak for the defendants?

MR. TALKIN: Your Honor, this is Sam Talkin. I guess I can, since Mr. Cahill is listed first on the indictment.

I think that obviously we would ask for 90 days to come back so that we can get the discovery, analyze it, and then we can come back and probably give your Honor a better

picture about what motions we would file.

We would coordinate -- for example, Title III we would coordinate so you don't get 11 Title III suppression motions.

THE COURT: I would really appreciate that.

MR. TALKIN: We'll get that done for you, your Honor. And then other motions that have overlapping interests, we will work on that. So I think if you give us 90 days, we can put our heads together both with our clients and the lawyers and give your Honor an idea of where we're headed. That's assuming, obviously, we get the meaty discovery within that 60-day period.

THE COURT: Does anybody have an objection to that from the defense perspective?

MR. EBANKS: This is Al Ebanks, your Honor. I represent Patrick Hill. I don't have an objection. I think that 90 days sounds like the right amount of time minimally, I would say, your Honor, just so that we can really get a handle on the discovery.

So assuming we receive it any time soon, I'm hoping that 90 days sounds right to the Court, your Honor. It sounds like we should be able to wrap our head around this by then.

MR. TALKIN: Your Honor, if 90 days -- if it becomes clear that it's not enough, we'll obviously file a letter with the Court.

THE COURT: Ninety days doesn't sound like a problem

to me. So when is 90 does from now? The 28th/29th of January.

Mr. O'Neill?

2.3

THE DEPUTY CLERK: We'll assume that we'll be in person on that date?

THE COURT: We'll assume that we'll discuss that as the date draws closer.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: So the 28th at 4:00.

MS. ABATE: Your Honor, this is Camille Abate for Kevin McCarron. I just want to apprise the Court that I have a suppression hearing in front of Judge Rakoff on January 27 which may go more than one day. I don't know if you want to do it a little bit before or a little bit after, but I want to make sure I'm able to appear on the next date of this case.

THE COURT: I think Judge Rakoff will let you go at the end of the second day of the suppression hearing.

MR. SAPONE: Your Honor, this is Ed Sapone for Mr. Kraft. Nice to see your Honor.

THE COURT: What are you going to do to screw this up?

MR. SAPONE: Absolutely nothing. I certainly wouldn't screw anything up in this courtroom. But I'm going to be on trial the whole month of January, and I'll have someone cover, with the Court's permission. I'll make that application when we get closer.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. SAPONE: Thank you.

THE COURT: So let's put it on for 4:00 on the 28th and give Ms. Abate two full days. Judge Rakoff doesn't tend to go -- these days anyway, he doesn't tend to go beyond 4:00.

And time is excluded in the interests of justice. The defendants' interest in a speedy trial is outweighed by the need for them to get their hands on what sounds like quite voluminous discovery, start making their way through it, and to put together a plan of action which they are in no position to make now.

I should put on the record that under the Cares Act, that it is the opinion of this Court that in view of the rising number of cases in New York, that it is necessary and advisable for us to hold proceedings, wherever possible, remotely by video, as this proceeding has been, or by audio. Some people are on an audio.

And I hereby make all the findings necessary to be made under the Cares Act to authorize the holding of this proceeding in this remote manner. The defendants have all consented orally on the record, and written consents will be submitted if they have not already been submitted.

Okay?

2.3

MR. TALKIN: Yes, your Honor.

MS. ABATE: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else from the government?

MR. SWERGOLD: No. Thank you, your Honor.